

Remarks/Arguments

The present amendment is made in response to the final Office Action dated July 31, 2003, and identified as Paper No. 12. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 15 and 16 remain in the application.

Informalities

In the Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure because of informalities in the Brief Description of the Drawings. Appropriate correction has been made, as set forth in the above Amendment to the Specification.

Objections to the Specification

In the Action, the Examiner objected to the amendment filed 1 August 2002, asserting that it introduced new matter into the disclosure in that Applicant's amendment of Fig. 1 to delete reference labels (8,9) also deleted the curve portions of the substrate to which those reference labels were directed. Applicant hereby cancels the amendment of Fig. 1 that the Examiner objected to as new matter and encloses as part of this amendment an amended Fig. 1 that deletes reference labels (8,9) as requested by examiner in the first Office Action, but retains the curve portions of the substrate to which reference numerals (8,9) were directed.

The Examiner also objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "third conductor" as recited in claim 7. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to page 8 of the application at lines 16-21, page 13 at lines 14-21, and Figures 8, 9. These portions of the specification disclose an embodiment of the present invention in which a plurality of

coplanar conductor lines cross over a first conductor line and are separated from the first conductor line by a ground plane layer.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 15 and 16 are pending in the application. As set forth above, Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 4. The Examiner's objection to those claims is therefore moot.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it is unclear whether the "second electrical path" properly traverses from "one end" to the "opposed end" of the crossover. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Figs. 8 and 9 which depict two electrical paths (33a and 33b) traversing from one end of the crossover to the opposed end.

The Examiner also rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because "said second conductor at least one line ..." is vague. The Examiner further asserted that it is unclear what characterizes "said dielectric layer laterally spaced from said second conductor line." As set forth in the above claim amendments, Applicant has amended the claim to remove the vagueness and lack of clarity asserted by the Examiner. Specifically, Applicant has removed "at least one" from the clause that the Examiner found to be vague, and Applicant has amended the clause referring to lateral spacing to make clear that the lateral spacing is between the second conductor and the third conductor.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it is unclear which one(s) of the “at least one second conductor line” is intended by the respectively recited “said second conductor line(s).” As set forth in the above claim amendments, Applicant has amended claims 6, 7 and 8 to eliminate recitation of “at least one second conductor line.”

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it is unclear as to which termination contacts are intended. As set forth in the above claim amendments, Applicant has amended claim 8 to correct the lack of clarity asserted by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it improperly depends from previously cancelled claim 14. As set forth above, the Applicant has amended claim 16 to depend from allowed claim 15, thereby eliminating the indefiniteness asserted by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

In the Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 2 and 15. As Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 2, as set forth in the above claim amendments, the Examiner’s objection to those claims is moot. The Examiner objected to claim 15 because “at least one” was not associated with subsequent recitations of “first and second conductors.” As set forth in the above claim amendments, Applicant has amended claim 15 as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated July 31, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 9-11 as being unpatentable over Iwami in view of Whybrew (both of record). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4 and 9-11. Despite this traversal, Applicant has cancelled claims 1-4 and 9-11 without prejudice to filing a continuation application seeking coverage for those claims, and has amended claims 15 and 16 to place claims 13, 15 and 16 into condition for allowance.

In the Action, the Examiner stated that Applicant's previous arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 5, 6, 9-11, 12-14 and 16 had been considered but deemed moot in light of the Examiner's new grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claim 5. Despite this traversal, Applicant has cancelled claim 5 without prejudice to filing a continuation application seeking coverage for that claim. Claim 6, however was previously rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Powell et al and Whybrew et al. In Applicant's amendment dated September 10, 2001, claim 6 was amended to depend from claim 7, a claim that is not anticipated. Because claim 6 has been amended herein to overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is now allowable because it depends from an unanticipated and non-obvious claim.

Application Serial No. 09/466288
Amendment dated November 17, 2003
Page 12

Also enclosed herewith is a Petition for a One Month Extension. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the one month extension fee and to charge any deficiencies or credit any over-payment to Deposit Account 50-1546.

In view of the foregoing amendments, the Examiner's reconsideration is requested and allowance of the present application is believed to be in order. If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would aid in the examination of the application, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2003



Robert J. Sinnema
Registration No. 53,599
Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC
One Lincoln Center
Syracuse, NY 13202
315-218-8170